DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 649 CG 008 598

AUTHOR	Sedlacek, William E.; Brooks, Glenwood C., Jr.
TITLE	A Procedure for Eliminating Racism in our Schools.
INSTITUTION	Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
REPORT NO	RR-1-74
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	25p.; Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, Montreal, Canada, 26-31 August 1973
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Agents; Changing Attitudes; *Cultural Differences; *Demonstration Programs; Minority Groups; Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; Racial Discrimination; *Racism; *School Integration

ABSTRACT

This procedural model includes progressive stages which must be worked through by an individual or institution in the process of change. These are: (1) Cultural and Racial Differences; (2) Racism and How It Operates; (3) Examining Racial Attitudes; (4) Sources of Racial Attitudes; (5) Behavior; What Should Be Done?; and (6) Behavior; How Should It Be Done? Examples of racism from elementary, secondary and higher education are presented and discussed. The article emphasizes methods for the change agent and raises several points: (1) Anytime a strategy becomes a goal we sow the seeds of institutional discrimination; (2) Goals are temporal and must be adjusted to the context of the times; and (3) The greatest effort should be expended on those goals which most clearly work against racism rather than attempting a "fight to the death" on all issues. Suggested roles for minority and majority group members in fighting racism are made. Questions put to change agents such as "Why are you always so negative?"; "What makes you think you are so right all the time?"; "This is our issue, what the hell do you know about it?" and "Does the end justify the means?" are discussed and answered from the writers' perspective. Discussions of applications of the model to other than black-white situations are also included. (Author)

ED 085649

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CG 008 598

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085649

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

1974

A PROCEDURE FOR ELIMINATING RACISM IN OUR SCHOOLS

William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 1-74

Portions of this article were presented at the American Psychological Association Convention in Montreal; August 30, 1973.

CULTURAL STUDY CENTER

A PROCEDURE FOR ELIMINATING RACISM IN OUR SCHOOLS

William E. Sedlacek and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr.

Research Report # 1-74

SUMMARY

An elaboration of a method of eliminating racism earlier presented by the writers is discussed. The model includes progressive stages which must be worked through by an individual or institution in the process of change. These are I. Cultural and Racial Differences, II. Racism and How It Operates, III. Examining Racial Attitudes, IV. Sources of Racial Attitudes, V. Behavior: What Should Be Done?, and VI. Behavior: How Should It Be Done? Examples of racism from elementary, secondary and higher education are presented and discussed. The article emphasizes methods for the change agent and raises such points as (1) Anytime a strategy becomes a goal we sow the seeds of institutional discrimination. (2) Goals are temporal and must be adjusted to the context of the times. (3) Work hardest on those goals which most clearly work against racism. Do not "fight to the death" on all issues. Suggested roles for minority and majority group members in fighting racism are made. Questions put to change agents such as "Why are you always so negative?"; "What makes you think you are so right all the time?"; "This is our issue, what the hell do you know about it?" and "Does the end justify the means?" are discussed and answered from the writers' perspective. Discussions of applications of the model to other than black-white situations are also included.

Racism is a word bandied about, often with little consensus or understanding of its meaning. While many educators, counselors and personnel workers are called upon to provide assistance with interracial problems in our schools, most professionals appear to give little concern or recognition to racism or their own roles in fostering it. The purpose of this article is to outline and describe an approach or model which can be used in eliminating racism. Racism will be defined and analyzed, and procedures and principles of working against it will be discussed. The model has been developed over several years and is based on research and applied work in a variety of settings and educational levels. The model is aimed primarily at changing whites or white oriented institutions or in essence those who control the bulk of our educational system.

There are a number of major principles on which the model is based. First, the model is outcome oriented or what will be called behavioral. That is, the emphasis is on the results of actions of those attempting change, rather than on the actions themselves. A trap regularly encountered by the well intended change agent is to be concerned with process or method without relating it to well specified goals or strategies. A second principle is that methods of monitoring success at each stage of the model are provided.

The model is also seen as progressive in that it appears important to work through the various stages in order, so as to build upon each earlier stage. A common mistake made by the change agent is to begin to discuss strategies for change before determining whether people perceive and understand the problem. The model should be applied so as to provide a minimum intrusion on the people or institution one is attempting to change. Shocking someone may prevent reaching them or communicating with them. The purpose of moving people through the model should be kept in mind. Whatever will facilitate this movement should

be employed. While the purpose is not to provoke people deliberately, it should be recognized that a successful implementation of the model will likely result in shaking up the values, perceptions and ideas of many people. Change requires some discomfort and doubt. In fact, one intermediate criterion of the success of the model is whether people are thinking new thoughts and expressing or acting out doubts about their present behaviors.

Another requirement of the model is the participation of minority and majority group members as change agents or consultants. Racism is well entrenched in society and must be ganged up on from many vantage points. Many important and differential roles for majority and minority consultants will be discussed in the article.

In order to demonstrate the model, key principles used in each stage will be listed and discussed. Examples for implementations of the model at various levels of education will also be presented. The most common format for applying the model has been in a conference or workshop setting over several days at the request or at least permission of a school or educational unit (e.g., university department). However, examples covering the initiation of social change in reluctant organizations will also be covered. The model has been used with students, faculty, staff, administration, parents, etc.

Stage I - Cultural and Racial Differences

Key points to be understood: *1.* Cultural and racial differences exist: they should be openly discussed and understood by all. *2.* Differences can and should be approached positively in and out of the classroom. *3.* Black (minority) expressions of racial and cultural identity are necessary and healthy for blacks and the rest of society. *4.* Most white teachers are not prepared by background

or training to work with most of the minority students they encounter. 5. Minorities may act differently, and generally more negatively, to authority in a society many feel has oppressed them.

Many people have trouble dealing with differences as positive concepts. The epithet "I treat everyone exactly alike" is heard often. Most people, however, are at least willing to explore this stage since it is relatively impersonal to be exploring traits of another group. Again the assumption is that the model is aimed at whites. A danger here is to make sure you do not leave the impression that if everyone had just a few "tips" on how to deal with minorities, the problem would be solved. Getting across the idea that culture is dynamic, temporal and geographic is important. Thus, lists of words to use or not use or cultural habits should be placed in a broader context.

Written materials or questionnaires or tests can be used effectively at this stage. Noar's *Sensitizing Teachers to Ethnic Groups* (1) and materials from the Foundation For Change, 1814 Broadway, New York 10023, have been useful as handouts. During group sessions the Dove Counterbalance Intelligence Test (mimeographed) and the Black Intelligence Test of Cultural Homogeneity (BITCH) Test by Robert L. Williams at Washington University, St. Louis, can be effective devices to make the points. This raises a classic problem in this area often noted by librarians, black curriculum specialists, etc.,: the materials are available but often sit on library shelves. Without training most teachers are unlikely to feel comfortable with or oriented to experimenting with new materials or curricula.

Stage I is critical because credibility with those you are interested in changing must be established here. The authors have conducted several workshops where this was not adequately done and the results were poor in terms of moving

through the model. Credibility for a white consultant means being informed about racial and cultural differences and providing help and insight to others. The minority consultant has been the target of racism and can relay his or her own experiences and background to the points being made. At the beginning of the model whites feel that they must hear it from the "horse's mouth" and eagerly hang on the words of the minority consultants in early stages of the model. Blacks or minorities often feel that only one of their kind could understand. It is important then that the white consultant be informed, helpful and sensitive but not to the point of feeling that he or she is like or interchangeable with a minority person. The white can never be an "insider" or a formal member of a minority group because of experience in the society. But it is also important that a white demonstrate that it is possible to learn about racism through the experiences of others, research and one's own observations and behavior. Indeed this is at the heart of the model. One needn't be a minority to understand racism. Without this premise a model focusing on white racism would be meaningless. In fact it may be an advantage to be white in understanding and combating racism, because the white individuals and institutions have the power to practice racism in America. A white consultant may have a better entré and understanding of these institutions than a minority person. This possibility should be used to full advantage at later points in the model.

Stage II - Racism and How It Operates

Key points to be understood: 1. Individual racism is action taken by one individual toward another which *results in negative outcomes* because the other person is identified with a certain group. The group may be racial, cultural, sexual, ideological, etc. *2.* Institutional racism is the action taken by a social system or institution which *results in negative outcomes* for members of

a certain group or groups. *3.* The definitions of racism are behavioral in that *results, not intentions, are important.* Most racism is unknowing or unintentional. *4.* Power to influence others rather than numerical relationships of majority to minority is critical. *5.* Some examples of racism commonly found in American education are:

A. Elementary and Secondary Level

1. Segregated system with blacks in pockets, resulting in fewer facilities, fewer teachers, and less money spent per pupil on black students.
2. Because supervisors are less prepared and perhaps less comfortable in dealing with teachers and problems in primarily black schools, fewer visits may be made to these schools.
3. Few blacks in supervisory or central staff positions.
4. Most parts of the school curricula are oriented toward white middle class children.

B. Higher Education

1. Biased admissions standards resulting in fewer black students.
2. Lower expectations of black student performance by faculty.
3. Counselors not knowledgeable of minority student problems and concerns
4. Programs related to minorities tend to be understaffed and underfunded.

6. Since most of society is run by and for whites, racism is primarily a white problem. Unless whites are able to change individually and collectively through institutions, white racism is likely to remain. *7.* Racism is analogous to alcoholism in that if we say, "Well, maybe I drink a little too much occasionally," we are not likely to begin to deal with our problem. However, if we understand

and admit our alcoholism, we can begin to work on it. We are all racists and should begin to work on our problem.

While the concept of institutional racism is difficult for many people to understand, progress can be made in understanding how school policy and everyday practices of teachers, administrators and policy makers could be detrimental to minorities, regardless of intentions. Many of the examples of racism can be discussed and supported with evidence at length. Due to space limitations, the reader is referred to other sources for development of these and related topics (see notes 2 through 10).

Many people may still be operating at a comfortable intellectual level but some begin to get very defensive, perhaps in anticipation of what is to come. Several points in the development of the model should be made here. The first session is aimed at picking up participants where they are and getting them involved. If they can see that differences can be approached positively and *then* be made to see that the white society creates some negative differences and that it is whites who must work on *their* problem, the whole orientation and outlook will be much different for most participants.

It is often best to let the white consultant or consultants lead this session or stage because of face validity (e.g., white knowledge of one's own institutions) and the deliberate attempt to shift from dependence upon a minority consultant. If the model is working properly there is early dependence on minorities to "tell it like it is," then a shift to feeling the white consultants have the "answer" to the ultimate individual acceptance of the responsibility for racism. The process is often gradual but the writers feel the shift must be made or the model may not work. As noted earlier the shift in dependency from minority to white consultants and then to individual responsibility, can be used as intermediate criteria of success of implementation of the model.

The white consultant should be able to answer the question put by a minority: "This is our issue and concern, what the hell do you know about it and why should you care?" One reasonable answer is that it is your issue (yours as a white) and people (whites) who set things up and practice most of the racism, which has in turn made you what you are. You don't like it and it is your responsibility to change it. Many minority people may still be skeptical but your job is to convince them through your actions. Note that for many minority people your initial motive is demanded and challenged. If you are able to state a reasonable motive, such as that noted above, and back up that motive or motives with *behavior*, many minority people will at least give you the benefit of the doubt.

Another question which a white change agent should be able to answer is "What makes you so superior to the rest of us; aren't you a racist?" A possible answer is that you are not superior and are simply a racist who has learned something about his or her racism and is trying to do something about it. Again, straightforward unemotional, analytical responses are recommended. Honesty and behavior consistent with stated values breed credibility.

Stage III - Examining Racial Attitudes

Key points to be understood: *1.* Most people have negative attitudes toward other races and cultural groups. *2.* Racial attitudes may directly influence behavior. *3.* Racial attitudes can be measured and analyzed. The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) was developed for this purpose. *4.* Whites generally react more *negatively* to blacks than to whites in a personal or social situation (e.g., neighbors, engagements). *5.* Whites react more *positively* to blacks than to whites in a service role (e.g., magazine salesmen, policemen). *6.* White females react particularly negatively to sexual or physical contact with blacks. *7.* Racial attitudes can be changed.

People complete the Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) anonymously. The SAS was designed to measure the attitudes of whites toward blacks in ten personal or social situations (see notes 11 through 14). Two forms of the SAS were created; Form A makes no mention of race; Form B is identical to Form A except that the word "black" was inserted into each situation in Form B. Half the participants complete Form A and the other half Form B. Forms are distributed randomly so that any average or mean differences found in responses to the forms can be attributed to the word "black."

Results usually indicate generally negative attitudes toward blacks with a strong negative reaction to Situation V (Your best friend has just become engaged to a black person). Respondents tend to feel sad, intolerable, insulted, angered, fearful, hopeless, unexcited, wrong, and disgusting in their reactions to the situation. Respondents tend to feel positive toward blacks in Situations III (It is evening and a black man appears at your door saying he is selling magazines) and VI (You are stopped for speeding by a black policeman). Respondents tend to feel receptive, excited, glad and pleased toward the black magazine salesman and calm, friendly, cooperative, pleasant and accepting toward the black policeman. These results have been interpreted in other studies (see notes 11 through 14) as indicating that these seemingly positive attitudes reflect the feeling that "service roles" more distant from close contact are appropriate for blacks.

A summary of the feelings of a hypothetical typical respondent would be "It's OK for blacks to sell me magazines or be policemen but they had better not come much closer or, in particular, get engaged to any of my friends!" Interestingly, the SAS has been applied to outgroups in other countries and a similar pattern of attitudes has emerged (see notes 15 and 16).

Racial attitudes may seem to be contradictory to the key point of the model: emphasizing consequences rather than motives. The necessity of dealing with attitudes seems to exist for several reasons. First, most people seem to feel that racial attitudes and racism are synonymous before they receive training with the model. One object of the model is to cover the topic of racism from many angles so that the inseparable conclusion for most is that they practice racism in one way or another and they should work on it in one or more of the pragmatic methods discussed in later sections. Thus, it seems important to deal with attitudes head on so that people do not have a potential haven or refuge from reality.

Second, dealing with attitudes seems to strongly reinforce the point made earlier that individual responsibility is critical to generating change. It should also be noted that an attempt is made to make people aware of their attitudes and how that may affect their behavior in as non-emotional a way as possible. No "sensitivity" training or clinical procedures are intended or attempted. Rather individuals are assisted in looking at themselves in relation to others in such a way as to gain a glimpse of the complex emotional chasm represented by their racial attitudes but to keep from plunging over that edge into an area that may be difficult or impossible out of which to climb. The model attempts to move people individually and collectively along rapidly with minimum stops along the way. The quicker we can affect behavior the more successful the behavior.

Stage III is the most critical thus far in the model regarding the role of the white consultant. The topic is emotional and difficult to handle for many white conference participants or those you are attempting to change. Having a white consultant initially present and discuss the SAS is best because people

are more able to vent their hostilities and emotions at a white. The white consultant should remain calm, unemotional, analytical and continue bringing participants back to the goals of that stage. After the white consultant initially handles this stage it is often best for a black or minority consultant to wrap up the stage and again reinforce the goals of the stage. If a black initially covers the SAS results, participants often are not able to generate or vent their strong reactions and internalize them. If this occurs it may be difficult or impossible to move participants further in the model. Getting things "off their chests" to the white consultant makes them ready to hear the black consultant.

It should be pointed out that it is difficult or impossible for one consultant (or a group of all black or all white consultants) to carry the full load throughout the model. Black or minority and white consultants are critically needed at various points in the model. For instance, a white would have difficulty handling Stage I alone because of lack of knowledge or credibility. In turn many blacks have difficulty in dealing with white racial attitudes toward them. Ultimately our concern must be what moves people through the model, rather than the needs and abilities of the consultants. Consultants or change agents should be optimally employed, as with any other change strategy.

Stage IV - Sources of Racial Attitudes

Key points to be understood: 1. We all have racial stereotypes that determine how we feel and act toward other races. The SAS pointed this out. *2.* The nature of prejudice and racism should be taught at all educational levels. This is particularly crucial for young whites in that they are not likely to be able to avoid becoming racists without help. *3.* Prejudice and racism as well as black culturally relevant content should be an integral part of the regular

curriculum and not isolated as "black week," etc. *4.* Since we have defined racism and seen our own attitudes are negative, let's assume the racism exists and see what we can do about it.

Stage IV is often a short, nearly nonexistent phase. It often runs together with Stage III. However, in many situations it is critical and deserves specific treatment. As noted in the previous section, people are often very emotional and anxious as a result of Stage III. Many are eager and ready to move on to other more concrete things. This is desirable but we often find one of two situations exists. First, we find that if individuals or groups are too keyed up they are unable to deal with pragmatic problem solving. Stages V and VI call for facing some tough issues that are best not approached with an emotional hangover. Again the ideal state for a participant is to be somewhat anxious and ready to move, but not to a level that prevents clear hardnosed thought. Thus, a kind of buffer stage between the emotions of Stage III and the realities of Stage V is often called for. The stage affords a chance to calm down, assess the more intellectual implications of racial attitudes, how they develop, how they are perpetuated and ultimately what can be done about them. Generally Stage IV is less personal, or at least it is taken less personally by participants.

A second situation that often exists is that a group or an individual is slower moving and not quite ready to discuss problems and strategies. Such a group may need some "loosening up" or practice before moving on. This is particularly important in a heterogeneous group where some participants have been active and eager while others have been passive and nonparticipating. This stage affords bringing the more reluctant in the group into the action. This is accomplished through the use of role playing, which has been a positive

turning point in the model on more than one occasion for a number of people. The role playing centers on introducing racial variables in typical educational situations followed by discussion and analysis.

Stage IV emphasizes moving from the emotional aspects of racial attitudes toward a less emotional analysis and understanding of the sources and consequences of racial attitudes. Here white and minority consultants play similar roles, with the emphasis on getting participants to help themselves. If there is any emotional spillover from Stage III, it is likely best handled by the white consultant or consultants.

Stage V - Behavior: What Should Be Done?

By this time a person or institution moving through the model should be ready to get down to business. Business as we should know by now is to begin doing something about racism. But before we are tempted to jump in and start to shake things up we need to know what our goals are. Several principles of setting goals should be noted:

1. Goals must be stated to provide directions for change. This sounds simple but it is often overlooked. Without goals, energies and actions become misdirected and random, and effective change does not take place. With the background of earlier sections it should be possible to state desired outcomes or goals which work against racism. The more clearly we know what we are shooting for the more likely we are to accomplish it.

2. Goals should be as specific and behavioral as possible. Following this principle will help us to avoid the umbrella goal such as "to eliminate racism in our school" and substitute a series of subgoals such as "increase the number of black teachers" and "incorporate the contributions of minorities in the

Chemistry I curriculum." A behavioral goal is one more measurable and observable. For instance, "reduce the number of reported incidents of problems between black and white students" is preferable to "improve the interracial atmosphere in the school." In the former we have gotten more specific and observable than the latter goal statement.

3. Strategies are separate from goals in that they are ways of accomplishing the goals. Being able to separate means from ends is the issue here. In fact, the authors feel that failure to understand this relationship may be the greatest single contributor to racism and many other societal problems. Many of our social institutions were established for fairly benign if not benevolent purposes. *It is when the perpetuation of the institution, rather than its original purpose, becomes an end in itself that we have a problem.* For instance, our legal system originally developed as a means of equitably resolving disputes between individuals or collections of individuals and probably served this function in its inception. However, when the major goal becomes preserving the system itself rather than the effects of the system (e.g., is it equitably resolving disputes?) then we are making a mistake. Those who cry for "law and order" regardless of the effects of those laws are confusing ends and means (at least as originally intended). The authors recognize that maintaining an unjust legal system may be the goal of many people. As originally designed the legal system was a strategy to accomplish a goal of fairly resolving disputes. *Anytime a strategy becomes a goal we sow the seeds of institutional discrimination.*

Perhaps another example will help clarify the point. In order to accomplish the broad goal of combating institutional racism at the University of Maryland, and such specific subgoals as to increase black student enrollment and to offer seminars to incoming freshmen, etc., a group called the Campus Coalition Against

Racism (CCAR) was formed. Both authors served as leaders in this group. For several years the group accomplished many things including the objectives noted above. However, as students graduated and racism was replaced by the War in Vietnam or ecology, etc., as vital issues to many students, interest in CCAR waned. The biggest choice point came when some members of the group wished to shift the focus of the group from knotty racial issues to a broader based "human relations," "getting to know each other" group. This was suggested *in order to keep the group together*. Thus CCAR which was originally a strategy was in danger of becoming a goal. We suggested that the group disband, which it in turn did. Thus, no strategy should become reified and become the end in itself. The good change agent considers all strategies (institutions) up for grabs at all times.

4. Goals are temporal and must be adjusted to the context of the times. This relates to the above point about strategies. While enrolling more minorities in primarily white colleges and universities may be an appropriate goal for the 1970's, it might be totally inappropriate for the 1980's. Let us hypothetically suppose that compelling evidence becomes available that blacks will do better in the society by attending all black schools. The racism fighter in the 1980's would be trying to keep blacks out of most of our colleges and universities. Thus, work hard to accomplish those goals you have set but be ever willing to seek new information. It is basically a probability model. Work hardest and give most attention to those goals which are most important and which clearly work most directly against racism. Do not "fight to the death" on all issues big and small.

As an example of the probability model of action let us consider the case of a high school which was considering installing a course in Swahili for its black students. On the surface it sounded good but when other facts came out

about the proposal, it's probability as a good idea became near 50-50. The plan was to allow blacks to take the course in lieu of regular English. Opponents argued that this would deny black students a chance to learn or improve their English language skills and as one vocal opponent put it, "How many job applications have you seen in Swahili?" Thus, while the program may have provided some cultural enrichment for black students, it would have denied them some of their rights to a basic education. This was a goal that needed some restating before the authors were ready to push hard for it. It should also be made clear to the reader that such probabilities must ultimately be set by the change agent. Obviously many well intended people working for the elimination of racism would see things differently. The authors hope that this article will provide a more common basis for action and reduce the probability of opposing actions for change occurring.

5. All goals must be evaluated as to extent of accomplishment. Again a straightforward point often ignored. Once you have stated the goals be sure to come back and assess the degree of accomplishment, both large and small. It is easy to remember only the successes and forget the failures. Actually the converse often occurs with radicals and those concerned with change: we dwell on our failures and forget the successes. Actually the best change agent optimizes his or her successes and analyzes and learns from his or her failures. It is difficult to be realistic, but that is what is required. Notice that degree of accomplishment is emphasized. Ideally we have clearly stated goals and clear accomplishment or lack thereof. Yes or no; good or bad. Unfortunately results are often hard to evaluate. For instance, let us say our goal was to increase black staff by 10% and only a 5% gain was achieved. We should be in a position to consider that as partial success and, of course, partial failure. Evaluation is often little or poorly done in human relations or race related

programs. We would like to offer a general approach to evaluation which we have employed on a number of occasions. The first category for evaluation is *information*: what have people learned as a result of your program or actions? In conferences it is possible to develop a paper and pencil multiple choice or open ended recall type test to measure knowledge about racism. Effective questions testing knowledge we have used in the past include: (A) Define institutional and individual racism; (B) Cite three examples of institutional racism (a. in your school, b. in your town, c. in the society at large).

A second area of evaluation is *attitude change*. Here we commonly employ the SAS (see Stages III and IV) as a pre and post measure. Ideally there would be a control group receiving no treatment against which to check results. A third area of evaluation is that of stating specific *outcome goals*, both long and short term. This is of course the focus of most of this stage. A fourth category which we recommend, particularly if you are evaluating the work of others or grant proposals, etc., is to allow the program manager to provide any *additional objective evidence* on behalf of the program's accomplishments. This leaves it open to new ideas and critics who say "You just can't evaluate my program that way." But also note that it says objective evidence. "Gut" reactions are useless to the serious change agent. Most programs or change and/or goals can fit the above categories. The authors recommend applying these categories to all the change work you encounter, be it yours or that of others. Obviously not all the categories apply to all goals, but all goals should fit somewhere in the evaluation scheme.

In Stages V and VI the white and black consultants again play similar roles aimed at having participants assume responsibility and content. Consultants should be less directive and mainly serving the purpose of continually interjecting

the question or thought as to whether the accomplishment of a particular goal will work against racism or that a particular strategy will work. Serving as a resource on ways of stating goals and on the experience of others using certain strategies is also an important role for black and white consultants. But again the main creative work in Stages V and VI should come from those being worked with on the model.

Stage VI - Behavior: How Should It Be Done?

As we noted the previous section dealt with goals while this section will concentrate on the strategies one might employ in accomplishing a given goal. There is no one way to accomplish a given goal and the good social strategist has a variety of methods and techniques available at any given time. A simple example of this is a typical speaking engagement. We get called upon to make presentations at schools, before PTA's, neighborhood groups, campus organizations, etc. A good speaker tries to determine as much as possible who will be the audience, what will be the physical arrangements (e.g., auditorium vs. small room) and any content or format interests the group might have. However, there are often surprise conditions that necessitate a change in strategy. For instance, on one occasion the senior author was asked to "informally meet" with a few teachers about what they might do about racism in their school. Upon arrival it turned out that plans had been changed and the new format called for a formal address to an overflow PTA meeting called to discuss the issue, complete with irate parents, etc. Obviously the type of presentation one would give in an auditorium to 350 people would differ from that given to a small group of teachers. On another occasion we were called upon to run a three hour workshop session for a group of teachers but just before we began we were told that we only had an hour and a half.

Several lessons from these examples are worth noting. First, no matter how informal or unstructured the occasion appears the effective change agent is always prepared. He/she is not only ready for the highest probability event (e.g., the expected), but also the unexpected. Controlling the situation and keeping in mind that you are trying to change and influence others are important principles. If you are working toward goals these must be kept in mind and every opportunity must be seized in implementing the model. A talk to a group about racism is an implementation of the model. If you only have a short time, don't "blow it" by being unprepared. Probably the best general advice here is, after you feel comfortable with this or any other model, look for all the experience you can get in trying it out: set goals, develop strategies and evaluate outcomes. The greater variety of conditions with which you have experience the more likely you will be to handle emergencies and still accomplish your goals.

Another key ingredient to effective change is self confidence. Critics of change agents or the model are likely to say "Why are you always so negative?" or "What makes you think you are so right all the time?" An effective change agent should have an answer for these and many other questions; at least for him/herself. Those who accuse you of being negative are not likely to face problems realistically. Racism is a problem which requires a solution: if it is never diagnosed as a problem it will never be solved. The effective change agent uses the model as a pragmatic solution, not as something to feel emotionally toward one way or the other. The model is only as good as its outcomes. Actually few people in the world are as optimistic as an effective change agent. The change agent believes and regularly demonstrates that things can get better; that change is possible; that effort in behalf of change is worthwhile. This is hardly a negative position.

The other criticism noted (what makes you right) should again be pragmatically countered. Right is what works; wrong is what doesn't work. The reason you think you are right is that you have some evidence that your strategy does work and you are perfectly willing to alter the liklihood that you will use the strategy again if it fails. Thus, it is an open and honest system.

You will find that most critics do not have practical alternatives to offer nor do they have any system of operating. If their arguments and evidence make sense, change your strategy. But remember the *only* test of a strategy is whether it works. We are sure some readers are saying "Wait a minute, are you saying the end justifies the means?" Not quite. We are saying that the change agent should ask "Does this particular end justify this particular means?" Back to our probability model. Most of us would risk more extreme measures to achieve greater outcomes. For instance, how extreme would you go with a strategy to save your own life?, the life of a stranger?, the life of a daffodil? All of us operate with different probability systems. We are not advocating any particular strategies or goals for others. We can only report on how we see it and what we have done in given circumstances. We have not fully tested our limits on what we would use and what we wouldn't use as strategies. An open system where strategies are considered only good or bad or acceptable or unacceptable in relation to a particular goal has much to recommend in it. For one thing it helps reduce another classic bugaboo of the change agent: artificial self limitations. *Most of the limitations to effective change are self imposed.* This is a sweeping statement if we think about it. It says that it is really not my boss, my husband, the President, etc., that is holding me back, it is *me*.

Several additional sources are worth pursuing on points of strategy and related matters. We will not discuss them here due to necessary limits in the article (see notes 17 through 20). The model presented here is undergoing change and revision as new experience or research warrants it. For instance, we have had the most experience in applying it to black-white situations. Whether it has equal applicability to non-cultural or racial minorities such as women or homosexuals, we are less sure. We have been developing other measuring devices and techniques in these areas, however (see notes 21 through 24). We do hope that we have generated some new thoughts or ideas among readers which will result in some behavior change. This was our goal in writing the article.

Notes

1. G. Noar, *Sensitizing Teachers to Ethnic Groups*, New York: Allyn & Bacon, 1972.

2. W. E. Sedlacek, "Issues in Predicting Black Student Success in Higher Education," *Journal of Black Education*, 1973 (in press).

3. W. E. Sedlacek, "Racism in Society: A Behavioral Model for Change," New York: Behavioral Sciences Tape Library, 1974 (in press).

4. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Black Freshmen in Large Colleges: A Survey," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 49 (1970): 307-312.

5. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., *Racism in American Education: A Model for Change*, Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1974 (in press).

6. W. E. Sedlacek, G. C. Brooks, Jr., and J. L. Horowitz, "Black Admissions to Large Universities: Are Things Changing?," *Journal of College Student Personnel* 13 (1972): 305-310.

7. W. E. Sedlacek, G. C. Brooks, Jr., and L. A. Mindus, "Black and Other Minority Admissions to Large Universities: Three Year National Trends," *Journal of College Student Personnel* 14 (1973): 16-21.

8. W. E. Sedlacek, J. A. Lewis and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Black and Other Minority Admissions to Large Universities: A Four Year National Survey of Policies and Outcomes," *Research in Higher Education*, 1974 (in press).

9. C. M. Pfeifer, Jr. and W. E. Sedlacek, "The Validity of Academic Predictors for Black and White Students at a Predominantly White University," *Journal of Educational Measurement* 8 (1971): 253-261.

10. C. M. Pfeifer, Jr. and W. E. Sedlacek, "Predicting Black Student Grades With Nonintellectual Measures," *Journal of Black Education*, 1973 (in press).

11. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Measuring Racial Attitudes in a Situational Context," *Psychological Reports* 27 (1970): 971-980.

12. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., *Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual*, Chicago: Natresources, Inc., 1972.

13. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Racial Attitudes, Authoritarianism and Dogmatism Among University Students," *College Student Journal* 6 No. 1 (1972): 43-44.

14. W. E. Sedlacek, G. C. Brooks, Jr. and L. A. Mindus, "Racial Attitudes of White University Students and Their Parents," *Journal of College Student Personnel* 14 (1973): 517-520.

15. E. A. Chaples, W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Measuring Prejudicial Attitudes in a Situational Context: A Report on a Danish Experiment," *Scandinavian Political Studies* 7 (1972): 235-247.

16. G. C. Brooks, Jr., W. E. Sedlacek and E. A. Chaples, "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Danish and U.S. Racial Attitudes," *Research in Higher Education*, 1973 (in press).

17. S. D. Alinsky, *Rules for Radicals*, New York: Random House, 1971.

18. B. F. Skinner, *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*, New York: Knopf, 1971.

19. J. W. Gardner, *Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*, New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

20. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Racism and Research: Using Data to Initiate Change," *Personnel and Guidance Journal* 52 (1973): 184-188.

21. K. C. Christensen and W. E. Sedlacek, "Differential Faculty Attitudes Toward Blacks, Females and Students in General," *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1973 (in press).

22. A. M. Collins and W. E. Sedlacek, "Counselor Ratings of Male and Female Clients," *Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors*, 1973 (in press).

23. W. E. Sedlacek and G. C. Brooks, Jr., "Differences in Racial Attitudes of White Males and Females," *Journal of Nonwhite Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, 1973 (in press).

24. M. H. Herman and W. E. Sedlacek, "Sexist Attitudes Among Male University Students," *Journal of College Student Personnel* 14 (1973): 544-548.